

1 MICHAEL JAMES HUGGINS,

2 Petitioner,

3  
4  
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28v.  
KEVIN CHAPPELL, Warden of San Quentin  
State Prison,

Respondent.

No. C 06-07254 YGR

**ORDER RE MOTION TO STAY PENDING  
EXHAUSTION**

Petitioner Michael James Huggins is a condemned inmate at San Quentin State Prison. On September 27, 2012, the Court granted Petitioner's motion to stay these proceedings pending a competency determination. On January 10, 2013, the Court granted the parties' joint motion to continue the competency determination pending the decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Ryan v. Gonzales*, No. 10-930, *cert. granted* 132 S. Ct. 1738 (2012). On January 8, 2013, the Supreme Court issued a decision, *Ryan v. Gonzales*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 133 S. Ct. 696. Based on *Ryan*, Respondent moved to vacate the stay; the Court denied Respondent's motion and ordered the parties to submit a proposed schedule and procedures for determining Petitioner's competency.

The parties have since jointly submitted a Motion to Stay Federal Habeas Corpus Proceedings Pending Petitioner's Exhaustion In State Court of Claim Pursuant to *Atkins v. Virginia*. Petitioner avers that he has a viable claim that he is ineligible for execution under *Atkins v. Virginia*,

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

1  
2 536 U.S. 304 (2002) (holding that execution of the mentally retarded violates the Eighth  
3 Amendment). Accordingly, Petitioner and Respondent jointly move to stay federal proceedings  
4 pursuant to *Rhines v. Weber*, 544 U.S. 269 (2005) (authorizing a district court to stay federal habeas  
5 proceedings while a petitioner pursues unexhausted claims in state court), while Petitioner pursues  
6 his *Atkins* claim in state court. Pursuant to this Court's earlier Order of May 3, 2013, the parties  
7 have also jointly submitted a list of guilt-phase claims that are unexhausted and appropriate for  
8 review by the state court.

9       The Court has reviewed the parties' submissions and agrees that allowing the state court to  
10 resolve Petitioner's *Atkins* claim prior to continuing with further federal court proceedings is the  
11 most efficient course of action. In the interests of judicial economy, any unexhausted portions of  
12 Petitioner's guilt-phase claims – which would survive even if Petitioner is found to be ineligible for  
13 execution under *Atkins* – should also be brought to the state court's attention.

14       Accordingly, for good cause shown, it is hereby ORDERED that:

- 15       1) Pursuant to *Rhines v. Weber*, 544 U.S. 269 (2005), federal proceedings in this matter  
16 are STAYED until the California Supreme Court rules on Petitioner's state habeas petition;
- 17       2) Petitioner will inform the Court of the date of filing of his state habeas petition, and  
18 submit quarterly status reports thereafter;
- 19       3) Petitioner's federal habeas counsel may represent him during the exhaustion  
20 proceedings in state court.

21  
22  
23       IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 DATED: August 15, 2013

  
YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT